

**Attachment to Independent Case Review Report  
For CDRU # 6488 Case file # 95-257956.**

**Material Examiner:** Malone (RO)

**Remarks:**

**Case resulted in a guilty plea, no testimony transcript.**

CRM 824

# INDEPENDENT CASE REVIEW REPORT

Independent Review conducted by: Steve Robertson

Area(s) of Expertise: Hair and Fibers

Review commenced at: 2:15 PM (Time), 10/23/02 (Date)

File #: 95-257956

Laboratory #(s): 31028031  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

## Examiner(s) & Symbols

	Reviewed	Not Reviewed		Reviewed	Not Reviewed
RQ	X <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
UL	<input type="checkbox"/>	X <input type="checkbox"/>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Materials Reviewed

Trial testimony transcript(s) of: guilty plea-no transcript

Testimony Date(s): \_\_\_\_\_ Pages: \_\_\_\_\_

## Laboratory Report(s):

Laboratory Number: 31028031\* Date: Dec. 30, 1983

Laboratory Number: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Laboratory Number: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Examiner Bench Notes of: RQ and unidentified technician

Laboratory Number: 31028031  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Page 1 of 3

Initials: SRR

CRM 824 A

Was any other material reviewed? ☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please identify and/or describe the material: submitting agency letter dated Oct. 17, 1983

### Results of Review

File #: 95-257956

Item or Specimen # Reviewed: Q1-Q13, K3, K4, K6, K7

#### Review of Laboratory Report(s) and Bench Notes:

**Note: Numbered comments are required below or on additional pages for any "No" or "Unable to Determine" Responses**

- 1) Did the examiner perform the appropriate tests in a scientifically acceptable manner, based on the methods, protocols, and analytic techniques available at the time of the original examination(s)?  
☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ Unable to Determine
- 2) Are the examination results set forth in the laboratory report(s) supported and adequately documented in the bench notes?  
☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Unable to Determine

#### Review of Testimony:

**Note: Numbered comments are required below or on additional pages for any "No" or "Unable to Determine" Responses**

☒ Transcript not available.

- 3) Testimony consistent with the laboratory report(s)? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unable to Determine
- 4) Testimony consistent with the bench notes? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unable to Determine
- 5) Testimony within bounds of examiner's expertise? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unable to Determine

Page 2 of 3

Initials: SM

Comments

(Set forth by above question #, if applicable.  
Use "Additional Comments" Sheet, if needed)

File #: 95-257956

#1. It cannot be determined from the notes if the tests were performed in a scientifically acceptable manner.

#2. The results are not adequately documented in the notes. The notes are not dated, are in pencil instead of ink and use abbreviations difficult to interpret. The technician did not document the recovery of hair from the evidence. The examiner did not document the full range of microscopic characteristics of the suspect's and victim's known hair as he normally does.

Review completed at: 2:30 PM (Time), 10/23/02 (Date)

Total time spent conducting review (to nearest 1/4 hour): 0.25 hrs.

I hereby certify that I conducted this review in an independent, unbiased manner and that the results of my review are fully documented on this report consisting of a total of 3 pages.

Steve Robutka  
(Signature)

Oct. 23, 2002  
(Date)

Page 3 of 3

Initials: SM